

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed March 7, 2005.

In the present paper, claims 8, 11, 12, 14, and 17-21 are amended, and claims 10 and 13 are canceled. Claims 1-9, 11, 12 and 14-21 are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the Figure 6 because the reference numeral "118" should read --518--. Applicants have amended that figure as suggested by the Examiner. A replacement drawing sheet number 4/4 is submitted with this Amendment, including an amended FIG. 6.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings as not showing the elliptical cutting edge claimed in claim 21. To expedite allowance, Applicants have amended claim 21 to change "elliptical" to "having a curved shape." Applicants submit that a cutting blade having a curved shape is shown at least in FIG. 4, and that the application now complies with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to several informalities in the Specification. The Applicants have amended the Specification to correct each of the objected-to passages, and now submit that the Specification is in proper condition for allowance.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 8 and 12 because the element “the housing” should read “the body.” Applicants have amended claims 8 and 12 to correct that informality, and submit that those claims are now ready for allowance.

Claim Rejections, Section 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, stating that the claimed elliptical cutting edges do not meet the written description requirement and are vague. Applicants have amended claim 21 to claim cutting edges having a “curved shape.” Applicants submit that amended claim 21 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant further submits that support for the amendment of claim 21 can be found at least in FIG. 4.

Claim Rejections, Section 103(a); Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has rejected claim 10, 12, 13 and 17-20, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over various combinations of art. The Examiner has furthermore allowed claims 1-7 and 9 and has indicated that claims 8, 11 and 14-16 contain allowable subject matter.

Applicants have rewritten allowable dependent claims 11 and 14 in independent form, including all the limitations of the parent claims. Original independent claims 10 and 13 have been canceled. Applicants therefore assert that amended claims 11 and 14 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants have furthermore changed the dependencies of claims 12 and 17-21 to make those claims dependent on one of allowable amended claims 11 and 14. Applicants assert that

those claims are in condition for allowance at least because they incorporate the subject matter of the independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-9, 11, 12 and 14-21 are now in condition for allowance, and Applicants earnestly request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present case, the Examiner should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully,

By



Robert T. Canavan
Reg. No. 37,592

Canavan & Monka LLC
250 State Route 28, Suite 207
Bridgewater, NJ 08807
Telephone: 908-707-1568
Fax: 908-707-1574

Date: 5/17/05